DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 132 FL 021 713

AUTHOR Prado-Olmos, Patricia L.; And Others
TITLE Students "DO" Process: Bilingual Students' Interactions in a Small Cooperative Reading Group.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Santa Barbara.
SPONS AGENCY Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Baltimore, MD.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Students; *Cooperative Learning; Elementary School Students; English (Second Language); Grade 3; Interaction Process Analysis; Language Research; Primary Education; *Reading Comprehension; *Spanish Speaking; Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

The paper describes and examines the interaction of a group of Spanish readers engaged in a reading comprehension activity, specifically, the interaction as they put to paper an answer to a reading comprehension question. The study is a satellite study affiliated with an ongoing project examining the use of cooperative learning in elementary bilingual classrooms. The ongoing project is exploring the implementation of an elementary reading program called Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition with Bilingual Students. As part of this larger study, cooperative reading activities were systematically videotaped. For the purpose of this paper, a 6-minute segment with four spanish-speaking third grade students was identified, transcribed, and analyzed in order to explore the questions outlined. The questions guiding this research include the following: How do language minority students, working in a cooperative learning group, "do" answering reading comprehension questions?; What conversational work do students engage in when answering reading comprehension questions?; What resources are employed in responding to reading comprehension questions?; and What happens when a student's response is tagged as incorrect by other members of the group? A summary of the story read is given along with the transcription and analysis of the interactions. (Author/AB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 132

Students "DO" Process: Bilingual Students' Interactions In A Small Cooperative Reading Group

Patricia L. Prado-Olmos, Michaele E. F. Smith
Educational Psychology
& Margaret Szymanski
Hispanic Linguistics
University of California - Santa Barbara

AERA 1993
Atlanta, Georgia

FL021713

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Prado-Olmos
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Students "DO" Process: Bilingual Students' Interactions In A Small Cooperative Reading Group

In this paper we describe and examine the interaction of a group of Spanish readers engaged in a reading activity. Specifically, we examine the interaction as the students put to paper an answer to a reading comprehension question.

The study reported here is a satellite study affiliated with an ongoing project examining the use of cooperative learning in elementary bilingual classrooms. The ongoing project is exploring the implementation of an elementary reading program called Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987) with bilingual students and is supported by The Center for Research on the Effective Education of Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University.

Perspective/Theoretical Framework

The gap between minority student and mainstream student performance in schools is well documented (Durán, 1983; Walker: 1987; Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1989; DeLaRosa & Maw, 1990; Valencia, 1991). Two conclusions that these studies have found are that 1) ethnic and language minority students exhibit depressed educational outcomes and 2) the ethnic and language minority student population is growing. Recent efforts to improve the educational outcomes for language minority students have focused on developing instructional strategies best-suited to the population.

One instructional strategy which shows promise for improving the academic outcomes of language minority students but lacks ethnographic study

---

Prado-Olmos, Smith, & Szymanski, 1993
UC Santa Barbara

is the implementation of cooperative learning formats. Research indicates that monolingual students working together cooperatively often results in positive effects on such outcomes as academic achievement, interethnic group relations, self-esteem, liking of class or subject, acceptance of mainstreamed academically handicapped students, as well as general acceptance of others (Slavin, 1981). Although bilingual programs utilize this paradigm, there is a limited amount of research concerning language minority students placed in cooperative group settings (Slavin, 1990; Merino, 1991).

Recent work has begun to examine the use of cooperative learning with language minority students (Prado-Olmos, 1993; Prado-Olmos, 1992; Prado-Olmos, García, & Durán, 1991; Calderón, Tinajero, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1990). A major finding of these studies is that language minority students participate differentially in cooperative learning reading activities depending upon their needs for assistance from others in completing reading tasks (Prado-Olmos, García, & Durán, 1991). Another important finding is that, as a result of involvement in bilingual cooperative learning, classroom and task structures as well as teacher behaviors change over time from traditional, independent, unilateral and teaching-dominated to non-traditional, cooperative, multi-lateral and student-directed (Calderón, Tinajero, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1990). Another equally important finding is that language minority student interactions are characterized by identifiable patterns which make up a participation structure which supports and constrains student participation and behavior (Prado-Olmos, 1992). Furthermore, the role of the classroom teacher within the cooperative learning curriculum is critical to promoting and developing student interaction (Prado-Olmos, 1993).

In addition, educational researchers interested in social processes (which include linguists, sociolinguists, anthropologists and the like) have studied

---

classroom interactions. While much of the early work focused on classroom interactions as static realizations of preset formats (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Bellack et al, 1986), recent developments in the field, influenced by Gumperz (1986), Green (1983), Cazden (1986), Heap (1984), Hustler and Payne (1985), have illuminated the procedural nature of interactions. Thus, students are seen as constructing their activity as much as accomplishing it. Most of this work has looked at interactions of monolingual speakers of English (but see Cazden, 1986; Wong-Fillmore, 1982), but given the population composition of our classrooms today, it behooves us to look at other language groups (see Roseberry , Warren, and Conant, 1990).

Indeed, work by Smith and Lerner (1992) and Szymanski and Durán (1992) explores the nature of interactions between bilingual students engaged in reading tasks in cooperative classrooms. These researchers describe the language and participant interaction of students as they do different CIRC activities. Smith and Lerner (1992) examine opportunities for participation in whole class, small group, and partner activities and find that these configurations of teacher and all students, teacher and some students, students and other students, and partners provide different opportunities for discussion. As would be expected, whole class interaction often follows the recognized question-response-evaluation format identified by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Mehan (1979). In contrast, small group and partner configurations provide different opportunities for interaction and "instructed interaction routines" (see Smith and Lerner, 1992) are readily learned and applied by students. Szymanski & Durán (1992) report that the students' discussion in the cooperative learning curriculum has been supported and enhanced by instructional techniques and resources designed to mediate the group's

discussion. One such resource supporting students' discussion is the use of a pad of paper to facilitate peer negotiations over language forms; the student writes an unfamiliar word down on the pad and has a partner check its spelling. This is an example of a set of actions that the teacher has instructed the students to do. The partner has a number of responsive actions that she can carry out in checking the spelling: self, other members of the group, the original text, the dictionary, and ıally a human expert (usually the teacher or tutor). Another technique used to support discussion is for the students to be provided with a single sheet of paper on which the whole group needs to produce a single written answer to the story comprehension questions.

Building from this recent work on interaction analysis in the classroom and in pursuing the goal of studying cooperative learning interactions of language minority students, the study reported here explores how students respond to questions and subsequently put those responses on paper. The questions which guide this research are:

- How do language minority students, working in a cooperative learning group, "do" answering reading comprehension questions?
- What conversational work do students engage in when answering reading comprehension questions?
- What resources are employed in responding to reading comprehension questions?
- What happens when a student's response is tagged as incorrect by other members of the group?

Prado-Olmos, Smith, & Szymanski, 1993
UC Santa Barbara

Methods and Data Source:

As part of the larger study mentioned above, cooperative reading activities were systematically videotaped. For the purpose of this paper, a six-minute segment was identified, transcribed and analyzed in order to explore the questions outlined.

Four Spanish-speaking 3rd-grade students formed a cooperative reading group within a larger homogeneous reading group in a Southern California elementary school bilingual classroom. These students were two boys and two girls, between 9 and 10 years of age. An adult researcher was also present in the classroom. The researcher worked closely with the cooperative group and, at times, became a participant in the group discussions.

The cooperative learning reading program (CIRC) followed at the elementary school has a set program of activities. The investigative component of the reading activity is guided by "Treasure Hunts", a set of story-related tasks which, upon completion, provide some sort of treasure (in the form of the moral or point of the reading passage, in the learning of new vocabulary, or in the opportunity to discuss and pursue new ideas, etc.). The Treasure Hunt divides a story into two parts, with reading comprehension questions and a prediction question for the first part and reading comprehension questions for the second part.

As is the case with many curricular implementations, the classroom teacher in this data adapted the program of activities to fit her ideas of teaching and learning (Prado-Olmos, 1993) In this particular classroom the focus of student activity was on the production of answers to the questions. Therefore the students engaged in activities that would enable them to complete that primary goal. Students read the first or second half of the story, engaged in a group discussion of the reading comprehension questions

sporadically, and individually wrote answers to the reading comprehension questions. Comparisons of the activities reveals that students read the story and individually wrote answers more than 90% of the time and engaged in group discussions of the comprehension questions less than 50% of the time (Prado-Olmos, 1993). Ongoing work is exploring the interaction that did occur in small group discussion (Prado-Olmos, 1993) in order to more fully understand the role the discussion played in the construction of answers to the reading comprehension questions and in the reading program as a whole. As part of that understanding it is important to explore the talk that occurred when students were engaged in individually writing answers to the reading comprehension questions.

In this particular cycle of CIRC activities the students read the first half of the story, discussed the reading comprehension questions and prediction question in the small group, individually wrote answers to the reading comprehension questions, read the second half of the story, discussed the reading comprehension questions in the small group and engaged in individually writing answers to the reading comprehension questions. The segment described and analyzed here began with the "discussion" segment of the Treasure Hunt activities. The bulk of the interactive work began with the onset of the writing component of answering reading comprehension questions. The negotiation of the answer to the reading comprehension question, and therefore the discussion, ensues when the answer is to be written down.

The following is a brief description of the story the students read. The Two Rock Diggers is the story of two brothers who one day come upon an old woman in the forest. After the two brothers aid the old woman she transforms into the Queen of The Forest and rewards them with seven wishes. The Older Brother is delighted because he is unhappy as a rock digger and has always

wanted to be powerful. The Younger Brother is content with his life and declines the wishes. The Queen of The Forest insists that the Younger Brother keep at least one wish and the Older Brother takes the other six. The Older Brother proceeds to change from one thing to another, always seeking to be the most powerful thing in the world, until he finally ends up as a rock in the forest. One day, the Older Brother hears noises in the forest that signal the approach of the rock diggers. He calls to his Younger Brother for help and at one point suggests that the younger brother build a fence so as to protect the Older-Brother-Rock from the rock diggers. The Younger Brother hears him and uses his wish to transform the Older Brother back to what he was before, a humble rock digger. The two brothers live together at the edge of the forest, content as humble rock diggers.

The analysis begins at the point when E provides an answer to the fourth question on the Treasure Hunt: What did the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother? According to the text, the Younger Brother used his wish to transform the Older Brother from a rock to a rock digger. E gives this answer when the students are providing answers in the "discussion" activity. However, E does not provide this answer in the writing activity; his different answer then provides a place for discussion in the small group. Participants in the interaction include X, a female student, J, a female student, R, a male student and P, the adult researcher.

ANALYSIS:

Discussion in the Pre-writing phase

In the initial phase of the activity "answering reading comprehension questions", the children in this analysis preview the question and a possible

candidate answer together, as a group. The structure of this pre-writing "discussion" mimics the whole class teacher-led instructional format: students' attention is focused, the question is read, a student bids for a turn to answer the question, a turn is allocated, the student answers, and an evaluation of the answer is given.

Pre-Writing Phase: "Discussing the answer to question number four"

1		((J looks at E. E looks at J blankly.))
2	X :	**estás escuchando?** / are you listening?
3		((E nods at X. R watches them.))
4	J:	**okay, el número cuatro.** / okay, number four.
5		((E looks at the Treasure Hunt then turns to page two and reads question 4))
6	E:	**qué hizo el Hermano Menor para ayudar al Hermano Mayor?** what did the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother?
7		((E looks up at the others. X yawns, R looks at the book, and J yawns. E raises his hand and waves it around.))
8	E:	**uh, oh-**
9	X:	**dale** / go ahead
10	E:	**el Hermano Menor... el Hermano Menor... el Hermano Menor** the Younger Brother ... the Younger Brother ... the Younger Brother
11		**usó su deseo para el Hermano Mayor para que será** used his wish so the Older Brother so that he will be
12		**lo que era antes.** what he was before.
13	J:	**sí.** / yes.
14	P:	**verdad?**/ right?
15	J:	((starts reading the last question while E turns to P to talk))

On line 1, E and J exchange blank looks perhaps alluding to their lack of direction in the "discussion" activity. X takes the opportunity to move the

---

activity along by focusing their attention on line 2. X's question "estás escuchando" (are you listening?) implicitly commands them to listen as it projects the next action, the outloud reading of the next question. J then marks the group's place in the activity on line 4 with the announcement, "el número cuatro" (number four); again this introduces the next relevant action, the outloud reading of question four.

E, J's partner, takes the turn created by X and E for the outloud reading of the question on line 6. E reads the question aloud for the entire group: "Qué hizo el Hermano Menor para ayudar al Hermano Mayor?" (What did the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother?). After reading the question, E plays the role of the teacher and looks up to see if anyone is bidding to answer the question. When there is no bid, E assumes a student posture and raises his hand, demonstrating his desire to answer the question. Like the teacher-led whole class format, E waits for a turn to be allocated before he speaks; he holds his answer until X grants him the turn to speak on line 8, "dale" (go ahead). Once E has given his candidate answer, it is now available for "discussion" by the group members. In this case, the candidate answer accurately retells the story events, and J accepts it without hesitation. Since the candidate answer is shared as "correct" by the group's members, P's attempt to spark discussion on line 13, "verdad?" (right?"), is dismissed as irrelevant, and the students continue the "discussion" activity with question number five.

Discussion in Writing Phase

Ten minutes later, the students are individually engaged in writing the answers to the questions they have already seen in the pre-writing discussion phase. Here, the students' discussion over the fourth reading comprehension question is an extended and complex interaction involving both academic and

conversational "work". A sequential analysis of the interaction shows the conversational and academic resources the participants use to support the activity, answering a reading comprehension question.

The discussion episode evolves from E's aloud reading of the fourth question. While he may well be reading the question for himself, the out loud production of the reading makes his place and possible trouble spot available for all to hear. When E receives no response on the reading of the question, he proceeds to repeat it, this time providing a candidate answer. Whereas the verbalization of the question does not warrant an objection or agreement response on the part of the group's members, the candidate answer does make relevant an evaluation.

Writing Phase: "Writing down the answer to question number four"

16 ((J, E and X all working. R has been very distracted. Now he slouches in his chair, pulls book up in front of him on one end and hides his face behind it.))

17 E: ((reading aloud)) **qué hizo el Hermano Menor para ayudar el Hermano Mayor?**
what did the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother?

18 E: ((yawns and stretches, then turns to P))

19 E: **qué hizo el Hermano Menor para ayudar el Hermano Mayor?**
what did the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother?

20 **el Hermano Menor hizo una cabaña granda para que**
the Younger Brother built a big hut in order to

21 **proteger la piedra del Hermano Mayor.**
protect the Older Brother's rock.

22 P: [((mouths 'no'))]

23 X: [no]

24 E: **sí:** / yes

25 X: **le dio, le dio su deseo, su deseo para que se, para que se...**
he gave him, he gave him his wish, his wish so that he, so that he...

26 E: ((shakes his head 'no' then he looks to the TH sheet))

27 E: ((continues to shake his head 'no'))

Prado-Olmos, Smith, & Szymanski, 1993
UC Santa Barbara

28 P: ((nods head)) h::: **crees que está bien**((pointing toward materials on table))
do you think that's right?

29 E: ((reads)) **en qué se convirtió el Hermano Mayor con su**
what did the Older Brother change into with his
30 **último deseo? el HERMANO MAYOR...con SU: último deseo último**
last wish? the Older Brother ... with his last wish last

31 E: ((shakes his finger at X as he speaks and X wags her finger back at him))

32 X: **último. y el Hermano Menor tenía un deseo. el Hermano Menor**
last. and the Younger Brother had a wish. the Younger Brother

33 **lo ayudó dándolo su deseo para que, para que se convirtió**
helped him by giving him his wish so that, so that he changed

34 **otra vez en lo que era antes.**
again to what he was before.

35 E: ((shakes his head no.))

36 X: **acabas de leer el cuento.** /you just finished/finish reading the story

37 E: ((puts his head in his hands as if very exasperated.))

38 E: **yo sé pero, allí dice, cómo el Hermano Menor... qué hizo**
I know but, there it says, how the Younger Brother... what did

39 **el Hermano Menor para ayudar al Hermano Mayor? el Hermano Menor**
the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother? the Younger Brother

40 **hizo una cabaña [para que...]**
build a hut [so that...]

41 X: [((begins to shake head no))]

42 P: no

43 X: no:

44 (.)

45 P: **no, busca en el libro.**/ no, look in the book.

46 R: **aquí está, aquí está donde dice.**
here it is, here it is where it says.

47 R: ((puts the book down on the desk and shows the page to the group))

48 X: **pero no dice que él hizo una cabaña.**
but it doesn't say that he built a hut.

---

49 R: una cabaña? no / a hut? no

X engages the discussion with E on line 23, with a simple "no". E retorts with a contrary "sí" (yes) on line 24 which places the burden of proof on X; she must justify her disagreement with his answer. X begins to produce her candidate answer on line 25, but she is interrupted when E back tracks to read the second question: "En qué se convirtió el Hermano Mayor con su último deseo?" (What did the Older Brother change into with his last wish?) E stresses his pronunciation of "Hermano Mayor" (Older Brother) on line 30 , locating his trouble as being: what the Older Brother changed into with his last wish has something to do with the fourth question: what did the Younger Brother do to help the Older Brother? Recall that the Older Brother used his last wish to become a rock. E repeats "último" (last) on line 30 giving emphasis to the fact that the Older Brother had no wishes left.

X treats the trouble as originating in the issue of wishes; she shadows E on line 32 with her repetition of "último" (last (wish)). X adds that the Younger Brother had a wish and proposes another candidate answer: the Younger Brother gave his wish to change the Older Brother into what he was before. Her candidate answer is met with opposition from E.

X, unsuccessful in her attempt to convince E his answer is inaccurate, re'ers to the story text. On line 36, X makes a dual functioning statement: "acabas de leer el cuento" (you just read the story). Not only does this statement provide her with the needed authority to assert her candidate answer, but it also places the burden of proof on E.

X's statement on line 36 is a turning point in the discussion. Whereas the acceptable proof in the initial discussion is grounded in the students' memory of the text events, X's reference to the story shifts the acceptable proof to the

written text itself. On line 38, E acknowledges this shift and refers to the written words albeit of the story comprehension question he is trying to answer. E's repetition of his inaccurate candidate answer on line 39-40 and the subsequent negative evaluations from P and X renew the discussion; future proof must lie in the story text.

On line 45, P directs E to look in the book, "busca en el libro" and a search for the actual words in the text ensues. First R announces that he has located the page where the answer is written on line 46. X quickly adds to R's statement but clarifying that it does not say he made a hut; R agrees with her addition on the subsequent line.

As E continues to look for the written words that support his candidate answer, P initiates a sequence of turns that aims to reconstruct the order of the story events.

54 P: **el Hermano Mayor usó su último deseo para ser piedra, no?**
the Older Brother used his last wish to become a rock, right?

55 X: [uh huh]

56 R: [uh huh]

57 R: **aquí está la piedra** / here is the rock ((he shows the page that illustrates this))

58 X: **después, este, después el Hermano Menor le dio su deseo**
then, uhm, then the Younger Brother gave him his wish

59 **para que se convirtió otra vez en lo que era.**
so that he would change again into what he was.

60 E: **sí, pero yo- lo que dice.** / yes but I- what it says

61 P: **sí, pero no es VERDAD. qué dice en EL CUENTO? dónde está la cabaña?**
yes, but it isn't TRUE. what does it say in THE STORY? where is the hut?

62 ((10 seconds pause in the conversation. E starts flipping through the story. R gets up and leaves the table. E reads various parts of the story looking for the information. Here, the student notifies P that the microphones have been disconnected from the mixer))

---

63 **X:** **pero no se la construye.** ((3 full intonation units inaudible)) **léela bien.**
but he doesn't build it. ((3 full intonation units inaudible)) read it carefully.

64 **léela bien.**
read it carefully.

65 **E:** **=mira es la última página y eso es lo que dice.**
look, it's the last page and that is what it says.

66 **X:** **pues, léelo, en dónde dice de la cabaña?**
well, read it, where does it tell about the hut?

67 **(3.0)** ((E moves finger across text as he reads silently to himself))

68 **P:** **qué dice?** / what does it say? ((as she sits down))

On line 54, P establishes that the Older Brother used his last wish to be a rock. Both X and R agree with this event and R even shows the group the picture that illustrates this. X continues by repeating her candidate answer: the Younger Brother gave his wish so that the Older Brother would change back to what he was. While E agrees with this depiction of the story events on line 60, he still believes the written text has led him to infer something different.

Again P redirects E to the text on line 61: "qué dice en EL CUENTO" (what does the story say?). Specifically she asks for him to find where it says "la cabaña" (the hut). X shadows P on line 64 telling him to read the text carefully. Finally, E locates the page containing the words that support his candidate answer on line 65. X then asks him to read it aloud and reiterates that the group is expecting some mention of a "cabaña" (hut) on line 66: "en dónde dice de la cabaña?" (where does it tell about the hut?)

It is interesting to note the modelling role P plays throughout the book search segment of this discussion (lines 42 to 68). P's influence as a model discussant can best be seen in the P and X's action sequences. On line 42, P opposes E's answer with a "no" and is shadowed by X's "no" on line 43. When P begins to reconstruct the story events on line 54, again her statement is

seconded immediately by X on line 55. Then P redirects E to look at the story on line 61; seconds later X mimics P with the command "léela bien" (read it carefully) on line 64. Once E finds the page, X reformulates P's initial request on line 14, to find "la cabaña" written in the text. One line 66, X asks "en dónde dice de la cabaña" (where does it tell about the hut?) and is in turn shadowed by P on line 68, "qué dice". While P gets up from the table due to some trouble with the microphones, the shift in the model-shadow sequences from P-X order on lines 42-3, 54-5, and 61-4 to X-P order on lines 66-8 shows the powerful resource of an adult group member.

Once E finds the page where he read the written words that support his candidate answer, the group enters into a discussion about evidence and its validity.

69 E: ((finds a space in the book where the Older Brother asks the Younger Brother to build something around him. He reads the passage.))

70 E: ((reads)) **tienes que construir a mi alrededor una cerca alta.**
you have to build a tall fence around me.

71 E: ((looks at X))

72 X: **una cerca alta/** a tall fence

73 E: ((continues reading)) ... **y fuerte para proteja de los otros picapedreros.**
... and strong for protection from the other rockworkers

74 X: **éste está diciendo a éste** / this one is talking to this one

75 X: ((points to a picture in E's book of the Older Brother in the rock and the Younger One standing by the rock))

76 E: **por eso** / exactly

77 X: **y se la hizo? se la hizo?** / and he built it? he built it?

78 E: **sí/** yes

79 X: **no**

80 R: **no:.**

---

81 X: **no se la hizo, (1.0) no se la hizo** / he didn't build it, he didn't build it

82 ((P helps J with her microphone))

(.)

83 E: **por qué no está dibujado tú dices**
because it isn't drawn you say

84 X: **=no se la hizo** / he didn't build it

85 E: **come o:n:.**

86 P: **qué dice?** / what does it say?

87 R: **no se la hizo, porque después el Hermano Menor le dio su**
he didn't build it, because later the Younger Brother gave him his

88 **dese::o:, para ser picapedrero.**
wish, to be a rockworker.

89 E: ((flips the book's pages back and forth))

90 E: **dónde está él? dónde está él?** / where is he? where is he?

91 X: **es que no le entiendes que dice** / it's like you don't understand what it says

92 E: **[sí,] te entiendo pero, dónde está dice que ya se convirtió?**
yes, I understand you but, where does it say that he already changed?

93 R: **[ayyy]** ((he puts his head on his desk))

94 X: ((stands up))

95 X: **mira, aquí, no más que abajo dónde estás.**
look, here, just below where you are

96 X: ((points to a section in the book and sits on her desk))

97 P: **qué dice aquí?** / what does it say here? ((points to the same section in the book))

98 ((E starts to read a sentence))

99 P: **no, aquí, ((reads)) y el Hermano Menor pidió con cariño su único deseo.**
no, here, ((reads)) and the Younger Brother lovingly asked for his last wish.

100 P: ((looks up at E, turns his book back to him,smiles))

101 E: ((smiles and falls back in his chair))

102 R: **dije que no?**/ I said so didn't I?

103 E: ((turns back to his TH. R returns to the book and J turns back to her work))

---

104 (6.0)

105 X: **no lo entendía como estaba. parece que no había leído el cuento.**
he didn't understand how it was. it's like he hadn't read the story

On line 70, E reads the phrase which he believes illustrates the accuracy of his candidate answer; "una cerca alta" (a tall fence) is provided as E's evidence that the Younger Brother build a "cabaña". E then looks at X to see how his evidence is received. X repeats "una cerca alta" (a tall fence) and in doing so emphasizes that he still has not proven that "cabaña" was in the text. E shows he understands that X is unconvinced on line 73 when he continues to read for more evidence.

Unsatisfied with the written evidence found in the text, X begins to look at the pictoral evidence provided by the story illustrations on line 74. X points out that in the quote E has read, the Older Brother is talking to the Younger Brother. E agrees with her statement on line 76, but X remains unsatisfied with his evidence; she remains unclear as to whether the Younger Brother actually built a structure, fence, hut or whatever to help the Older Brother. On line 83, E shows he understands that she is unconvinced because the hut is not found in the story illustrations. When X firmly states "no se la hizo" (he didn't build it) on line 84, E's only recourse is a token "come on" on line 85.

R's candidate answer on line 87, enables E to shift the burden of proof. Instead of looking for the picture of the hut, E attempts to prove his answer is right by disproving R's, that the Older Brother changed to a "picapedrero" (rock worker). On line 90, E asks R to locate the picture of the rock worker. When this is not available, E returns to his previous argument on line 92; he asks for evidence that the Older Brother changed already.

To put closure to the discussion about evidence, X locates a passage that supports her candidate answer and directs everyone to look at it on line 95. P seconds X on line 97 and then proceeds to read the phrase on line 99 when E is unable to find it himself: "el Hermano Menor pidió con cariño su único deseo" (the Younger Brother lovingly asked for his last wish). It is important to note the ambiguity in this piece of evidence. While it carries strength because it is written in the story, the sentence does not describe what the Younger Brother's last wish was. The paradox in P's turn on line 99 lies on the one hand in her status in the group as an authority figure, and on the other in the sentence's ambiguity. Clearly P's authority overrides the unclear evidence she presents, for E steps out of the discussion on line 101 by falling back in his chair, physically removing himself from the "center ring".

In a post evaluation, R tells E that he told him he was wrong from the beginning (line 102) and X recaps the discussion stating that E did not understand how it was, it was as if he had not read the story.

Results and Conclusions:

Analyses of the videotaped interaction reveal a rich and detailed sequence of events that lead to the construction of one answer for one student. The interaction reveals the incredible amount of knowledge of reading and higher order thinking skills students use in constructing answers to story related comprehension questions. The students display concern with what the "right" answer is, they display intimate knowledge of the form and structure of stories, and they readily use numerous resources in their environment to support their answers and/or positions.

The students' concern with formulating a "right" answer is highlighted by the fact that the entire sequence of interaction is prompted by the erroneous

---

Prado-Olmos, Smith, & Szymanski, 1993
UC Santa Barbara

conclusion of one student. One students overhears the erroneous answer and her intervention begins the extended interaction.

The students' interaction vividly illustrates that the "right" answer is the result of process. The process includes numerous resources: themselves, the book, the writing in the book, the pictures in the book, knowledge of stories and their development, knowledge of how stories are presented in books and the use of illustrations. Students are very adept in utilizing the resources available in that they not only use what is in the story as evidence to support their positions, but they also use what is not in the story as evidence.

Thus students reveal an intimate knowledge of stories, their form and structure, and they especially have intimate knowledge of basal readers. As a consequence, this knowledge is available for use in the accomplishment of academic tasks related to their reading.

Furthermore, the students take a position and actively support it. They, in a sense, "dig in", take a position, and manipulate the resources and evidence in the environment to support that position. Indeed, in the end, it is the guidance of a teacher, prompted by students' inability to resolve the question, that ends the conflict.

Educational Importance:

This research is an initial step to filling a gap in the literature and knowledge on what is means for a language minority student to be schooled in a cooperative learning environment. Knowledge of the performance of language minority students on academic tasks in the dominant language can only enhance our endeavors to provide effective quality education. In a very ambitious light, the data reported here informs many aspects of our educational efforts.

Prado-Olmos, Smith, & Szymanski, 1993
UC Santa Barbara

First it provides us with baseline data for use in comparisons to performance when language minority students are transitioned to English-only academic contexts, as well as information to contrast with the performance of those students who are participants in immersion programs.

This research also informs us as to basic social processes in academic contexts. What happens in group work? There are numerous anecdotes and myths related to student performance in group work; the need for data is crucial. This research contributes to the body of research on group activity and learning.

The results of our research can also provide information for curricular decisions on materials and tasks: if we wish to teach critical and sound elaborative thinking skills, we need to design materials and assessments which allow for the students to explore and discover resources within themselves and the environment. Furthermore, the structure of activities within classrooms needs to support and even create the environment which promotes meaningful learning.

Transcription conventions

bold		original language transcription
period	.	sentence-final downward intonation
comma	,	clause-final downward intonation
question mark	?	sentence-final rising intonation
colon	:	sound stretch
dash	-	word or sound cut off
equal sign	=	latching
parentheses and period	(.)	micropause
capitals		speaker's emphasis
square brackets	[ ]	overlap
double parentheses	(( ))	transcriber's comments

Prado-Olmos, Smith, & Szymanski, 1993
UC Santa Barbara

REFERENCES

Bellack, A. A., Human, R. T., Smith, F. L., & Kliebar, H. M. (1966). The language of the classroom. Final Report. USOE Cooperative Research Project, No. 2023. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Calderón, M., Tinajero, J. & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1990, April). Promoting student interaction for biliteracy development: Bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), The Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 432-63). New York: Macmillan. 3rd ed.

De La Rosa, D., Maw, C. E. (1990). Hispanic education portrait released. NABE News, Vol. 13, no. 8, 1, 26-27.

Durán, R. P. (1983). Hispanics' Education and Background: Predictors of College Achievement. New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Durán, R. P. & Szymanski, M. (1992, November). Activity and interaction in cooperative learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Green, J. L. (1983). Research on teaching as a linguistic process: A state of the art. Review of Research In Education. Vol. 10.

Gumperz, J. J. (1986). Interactional sociolinguistics in the study of schooling. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), The Social Construction of Literacy. (pp. 45-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heap, J. L. (1984). Ethnomethodology and Education: Possibilities. The Journal of Educational Thought. Vol 18. No. 3, December.

Hustler, D. & Payne, G. (1985). Ethnographic conversation analysis: An approach to classroom talk. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods. London: The Falmer Press.

Lerner, G. & Smith, M. (1992, November). Opportunities for participation in cooperative learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Merino, B. J. (1991). Promoting school success for chicanos: The view from inside the bilingual classroom. In R. Valencia (Ed.), Chicano School Failure and Success Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990's (pp. 119-148). New York: The Falmer Press.

Pallas, A. M., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1989). The changing nature of the disadvantaged population current dimensions and future trends. Educational Researcher, June-July 16-22.

Prado-Olmos, P. L. (1990). Cooperative integrated reading and composition-an analysis of dyadic interactions: Project report. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California.

Prado-Olmos, P. L. (1992, April). An examination of student interactions in a small cooperative reading group. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, Ca.

Prado-Olmos, P. L. (1993). Exploring structure and interaction in small groups: An ethnographic study of cooperative group life in a bilingual classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Prado-Olmos, P. L., García, R. G., & Durán, R. P. (1991, April). Cooperative learning for bilingual students: A case study of CIRC implementation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, Ill.

Rosebery, A. S., Warren, B., & Conant, F. R. (1990). Making sense of science in language minority classrooms (Contract No. 300-87-0131) U. S. Department of Education.

Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1981). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, May 655-660.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). Cooperative Learning and Student Achievement. Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University

Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Farnish, A.M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: A Brief Overview of the CIRC Program. Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. Baltimore, MD.

Valencia, R. R. (1991). The plight of chicano students: An overview of schooling conditions and and outcomes in R. Valencia (Ed.), Chicano School Failure and Success Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990's (pp. 3-26). New York: The Falmer Press.

Walker, C. L. (1987). Hispanic achievement: Old views and new perspectives. In H. T. Trueba (Ed.), Success or Failure? Learning & the Language Minority Student (pp. 15-32). Cambridge: Newbury House.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1982). Instructional language as linguistic input: Second language learning in classrooms. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in the Classroom. New York: Academic Press.